| | Case 1:21-cv-01128-NONE-JLT Docum | ent 6 Filed 11/04/21 Page 1 of 2 |
|----|---|--|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | AARON PAUL WALKER, | Case No. 1:21-cv-01128-JLT (PC) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS ACTION 14-DAY DEADLINE |
| 13 | V. | |
| 14 | O. PACILLAS, et al., | |
| 15 | Defendants. | Clerk of the Court to Assign a District Judge |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee for this action. Therefore, on July 30, 2021, the Court | |
| 18 | issued an order directing Plaintiff to pay the filing fee or applied to proceed in forma pauperis | |
| 19 | (IFP) within 45 days. (Doc. 3.) Plaintiff failed to submit an IFP application or to pay the filing fe | |
| 20 | within the time provided. Therefore, on September 27, 2021, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show | |

ee cause, within 21 days, why this action should not be dismissed. (Doc. 4.) Although more than the allowed time has passed, Plaintiff has not responded to the order to show cause.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide that "[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth., City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a

Case 1:21-cv-01128-NONE-JLT Document 6 Filed 11/04/21 Page 2 of 2

1 party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g., 2 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a 3 court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 4 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 5 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). 6 It appears that Plaintiff has abandoned this action. Whether he has done so mistakenly or 7 intentionally is inconsequential. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to comply with the Court's orders. 8 The Court declines to expend its limited resources on a case that Plaintiff has chosen to ignore. 9 Based on the foregoing, the Court RECOMMENDS that this action be DISMISSED for Plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee and to obey court orders. The Court DIRECTS the Clerk of 10 11 the Court to assign a district judge to this action. 12 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District 13 Judge assigned to this case, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within 14 days of the date of 14 service of these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections with the 15 Court. The document should be captioned, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and 16 Recommendations." Plaintiff's failure to file objections within the specified time may result in 17 waiver of his rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing 18 Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 Dated: **November 4, 2021** /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston 21 CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 22 23 24 25 26 27

28